STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956.

Clauses—(contd.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now amendments to clauses of the States Reorganisation Bill. There is an amendment in respect of clause 33

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—Sri Pattabhiraman moved amedments to clauses 15 to 21 and Government wanted to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are in the middle of discussion with regard to clause 33. We shall finish this and then come to that.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—Sir, I move:

'(1) In sub-clause (2)

(*i*) after item (*a*), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(*aa*) the ten members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Bombay and Madras whose names were, on the 1st March, 1956, included in the electoral rolls of the Assembly constituencies of the States of Bombay and Madras transferred to the new State of Mysore and who, as from the appointed day, cease to be members of the Legislative Councils of Bombay and Madras, and"

(*ii*) In item (*b*), for the figures "29", the figures "19" shall be substituted and for the words, brackets and letters "clauses (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*)" the words, brackets and letters "clauses (*c*) and (*e*)" shall be substituted.

(2) In sub-clause (3), for the figures "60", 20", "5", and "10", wherever they occur, the figures '69" '23', '6', and '11' shall respectively be substituted.'

In having moved this amendment to clause 33, I do not want to take another opportunity to speak. On examination I find it difficult to accept the amendments moved by my learned friend Sri Pattabhiraman and others. They contemplate the continuance of the Legislative Council until the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore has been duly reconstituted, whereas the purpose of the Bill as also my purpose is to continue that House and there is no limit to its continuance. It is true the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore when it meets for the first time can take a decision of its own but we are not prepared to give any opinion here and now. We shall leave it to the Legislative Assembly of the new State, whenever it meets, for a decision to be taken, if at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"(1) In sub-clause (2)

(*i*), after item (*a*), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(*aa*) the ten members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Bombay and Madras whose names were, on the 1st March 1956, included in the electoral rolls of the Assembly constituencies of the States of Bombay and Madras transferred to the new State of Mysore and who, as from the appointed day, cease to be members of the Legislative Councils of Bombay and Madras, and"

"(*ii*) In item (*b*), for the figures "29" the figures '19' shall be substituted and for the words, brackets and letters "clauses (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*)" the words, brackets and letters "clauses (*c*) and (*e*)" shall be substituted.

"(2) In sub-clause (3), for the figures "60", "20", "5", and "10", wherever they occur, the figures "69" '23' '6' and '11' shall respectively be substituted."

What does Sri Pattabhiraman say?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—The House may decide.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment moved by Sri Pattabhiraman to vote. The question is:

"For sub clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2) until the Legislative Assembly of the new State of

(MR. SPEAKER.)

Mysore has been duly reconstituted and summoned to meet for the first time thereafter, the said Council shall consist of:

(a) all the sitting members of the Legislative Council of the existing State of Mysore;

(b) all the sitting members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Madras and Bombay as have been elected to represent the Constituencies within the area or areas as have been transferred to the new State of Mysore; and

(c) such other number of members to represent the territories not represented as before but comprised in the new State of Mysore in such manner as may be prescribed."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is the amendment moved by the Leader of the House. I will put it to vote.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—On a point of order. Now that you have already taken the vote of the House on my amendment, where I had said that "all the sitting members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Madras and Bombay as have been elected to represent the Constituencies within the area or areas as have been transferred to the new State of Mysore" this is again virtually what you now seek to put before the House at the instance of the Chief Minister. The difference is while I said "the existing members' he said 'ten members'. I do not think there is any material difference. So the House has already voted down the Chief Minister's amendment effectively.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This amendment I examined because it was brought to my notice earlier. Therefore, I put your amendment to vote.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I feel that you may kindly examine it for a minute more and then take a decision, because the House has already voted down my amendment saying that the sitting members of the Legislative Councils of Madras and Bombay shall not come here. While that is so, to ask again the ten members of Madras and Bombay shall come back if the Chief Minister's amendment is accepted when the House has already registered its vote, I leave it to you. Virtually and substantially there is absolutely no difference between my amendment and his, except this, that I am a humble member and he is the Leader of the House.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I support the point of order. When the House has already given a decision on a particular subject, though there may be some variation in the amendment . . . .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is the point.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.— . . . . in wordings, the substance of it has been voted down and that amendment cannot be put to vote at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have examined that point. We should not stand on technical formalities, but the question now is whether this is the same as the previous one.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—It is the same. If you give a ruling that it is not the same, I will accept. But as regards the other suggestion that we should not stand on technicalities, I respectfully beg to differ from you, Sir. If you give a ruling that this amendment is different from mine I will accept.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have examined that. I shall now put to vote the Chief Minister's amendment to clause 33:

'(1) In sub-clause (2)

(i) after item (a), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(aa) the ten members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Bombay and Madras whose names were, on the 1st March, 1956, included in the electoral rolls of the Assembly constituencies of the States of Bombay and Madras transferred to the new State of Mysore and who, as from the appointed day,

cease to be members of the Legislative Councils of Bombay and Madras, and"

(*ii*) In item (*b*), for the figures '29', the figures '19' shall be substituted and for the words, brackets and letters 'clauses (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*)' the words, brackets and letters 'clauses (*c*) and (*e*)' shall be substituted.

(2) In sub-clause (3), for the figures '60', '20', '5', and '10' wherever they occur, the figures '69', '23', '6' and '11' shall respectively be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Then I will reply in regard to clauses 15 to 21 relating to Zonal Councils. I have also to move the amendments tabled by me with respect to clause 21. I shall move them.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—I would like to speak on clause 15. If it is to be put to vote, I would like to speak before it is put to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

2 P.M.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Mr Speaker, yesterday when Sri K. Pattabhiraman moved his amendment to clause 15 and the subsequent clauses in Part III of this Bill, further consideration of the matter was held over because at first sight it appeared that the deletion of clause 15 suggested in Sri Pattabhiraman's amendment would not suit the requirements and the main purposes of this Bill. Then Sri Pattabhiraman proceeded to explain that while he sought to delete clause 15 he had something else in mind and he pointed out to this House that he had also tabled another amendment seeking to add a new clause at the end of the present Bill to be numbered as clause 122 in which what Sri Pattabhiraman had in mind had been set out very clearly and he explained it as providing the soul, if I remember the word aright, to the physical structure of the Zonal Council. What I wish to say with particular reference to clause 15 and generally with reference to Part III consisting of the other clauses as well, is this: Under article 3 of the Constitution the views of the Legislature are being ascertained with reference to the reorganisation of States. That is the main business with which this Bill deals. It would be very necessary for us at this stage to remember and to bear in mind constantly the contents of articles 3 and 4 of the Constitution. Article 3 says—

"Parliament may by law—

(*a*) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State;

(*b*) increase the area of any State;

(*c*) diminish the area of any State;

(*d*) alter the boundaries of any State;

(*e*) alter the name of any State:

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State or States specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule or the name or names of any such State or States, the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions thereof have been ascertained by the President."

Then, in article 4 it is said—

"(1) Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3 shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the law and may also contain such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions (including provisions as to representation in Parliament and in the Legislature

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

or Legislatures of the State or States affected by such law) as Parliament may deem necessary.

(2) No such law as aforesaid shall be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purposes of article 368."

Now, under article 4 it is necessary that the Bill which relates to the reorganisation of States in respect of which the ascertainment of the views of the Legislatures of States mentioned in Part A and Part B of the Constitution would be necessary must contain provisions for constitutional amendments which really pertain to the reorganisation of States. Part III which is under discussion and which contains the provisions in regard to the setting up of Zonal Councils and the functions with which the Zonal Councils are to be charged, cannot be said to be an essential or an integral part of the proposals for the reorganisation of the States. This is obvious because it is possible to reorganise the States without setting up Zonal Councils. It is just as easy to reorganise the States in the manner proposed in the Bill without setting up Zonal Councils as it would be to reorganise the States setting up, in addition, Zonal Councils for discharging advisory functions which are mentioned in sub-clause 2 of clause 21. What I wish to point out to the House on this occasion is this: I have nothing to say against the setting up of Zonal Councils on the merits of the question. If the Government of India think that the setting up of Zonal Councils charged with the advisory functions mentioned in that clause is likely to improve the co-ordination of policies as between different States which will come into the zone, then it is worth trying and I would not put forward any objection to the idea. But what I wish to point out is that for setting up the Zonal Councils authority is sought to be exercised under articles 3 and 4 of the Constitution. That, I submit, is not only not necessary but constitutionally unreasonable and perhaps constitutionally improper. Because, if these Zonal Councils are set up in exercise of the authority of Parliament set forth in articles 3 and 4, and if after some experience it is found that these Zonal Councils cannot work, or cannot work satisfactorily, or need to be done away with, or have to be transformed into something else, then, it will become necessary, as the House will easily perceive, to resort to the same procedure as is mentioned in article 3 for effecting the change or transformation. This, I submit, is not only not necessary but is likely to become very difficult, if not impossible, on a future occasion. It will be seen that what is really conceived in Part III is a mechanism, a constitutional device, for effecting better co-ordination of policy as between the States and for setting up some agency which will deal with inter-State disputes. Now it is amazing that whoever conceived the broad outlines of this part of the Bill should have overlooked the provisions contained in article 263 of the Constitution. I would read first the text of article 263 because it will help us to understand what it is that we propose to do by setting up the Zonal Councils. Article 263 which is the only article in Part XI of the Constitution reads thus:

"If at any time it appears to the President that the public interests would be served by the establishment of a Council charged with the duty of—

(a) inquiring into and advising upon disputes which may have arisen between States;

(b) investigating and discussing subjects in which some or all of the States, or the Union and one or more of the States, have a common interest; or

(c) making recommendations upon any such subject and, in particular, recommendations for the better co-ordination of policy and action with respect to that subject, it shall be lawful for the President by order to establish such a Council, and to define the nature of the duties to be performed by it and its organisation and procedure."

In regard to these Zonal Councils it will be seen that clause 21 of the Bill which refers to the functions of these Zonal Councils states:

"(1) Each Zonal Council shall be an advisory body and may discuss any matter in which some or all of the States represented in that Council, or the Union and one or more of the States represented in that Council, have a common interest and advise the Central Government and the Government of each State concerned as to the action to be taken on any such matter.

(2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of sub-section (1), a Zonal Council may discuss, and make recommendations with regard to—

(a) any matter connected with, or arising out of, the reorganisation of the States under this Act, such as border disputes, linguistic minorities and inter-State transport;

(b) any matter concerning economic planning; and

(c) all matters of common interest and benefit to the people in the field of social planning."

Now one can try to argue that the functions set forth in clause 21 of the Bill are either different from or cover a wider field than what article 263 provides for. But in fact it is not so. If I may say so to the House, a patient examination of the contents of article 263 side by side with the contents of clause 21 will show and will convince Hon'ble Members that the provision contained in article 263 is preferable to the arrangements suggested in Part III of this Bill. Whereas the setting up of the Zonal Councils would establish an intermediate authority which is likely to take away the already attenuated legislative and executive authority of the States which have formed the Indian Union, the setting up of a Council such as is mentioned in article 263 would not do that. Now, what is proposed in Part III which provides for the setting up of the Zonal Councils is: there will be Chief Ministers of the concerned States, there will be other Ministers drawn from those States and there will be Chief Secretaries and other officers from the respective States. That is as far as the composition is concerned. And as to the manner in which they are to function, certain provisions have been made. And in regard to matters with which they are to deal with clause 21 which I just now read out mentions certain things. I submit that the matters mentioned in sub-clauses (a), (b) and (c) of clause 21 (2) are all covered, and more than covered, by the provisions contained in article 263 of the Constitution. And this article has other merits for effecting any changes that may be considered desirable or necessary at a future stage, at a future point of time. It will not be necessary to bring the matter again before the Legislatures of all the States in the Union for the ascertainment of their views as to the proposed changes and it would be possible for the President who can constitute these Councils in exercise of the jurisdiction already vested in him under article 263 to effect those changes or to effect the transformation or to make such other provision as may be considered necessary or desirable. And there is this further point that nowhere in the proposed amendments to the Constitution which are contained in the annexure to the Bill is there any suggestion or proposal to do away with article 263 of the Constitution. This is to exist side by side with the arrangement suggested in Part III, especially in regard to Zonal Councils. Therefore I submit that the setting up of these Councils is not a necessary part of the reorganisation of States and as such if we proceed to set them up in exercise of the legislative authority contained in article 3 it would be not only an improper exercise of that authority but also it would be landing us in a position from which we cannot afterwards extricate ourselves except in the manner and by following the procedure laid down in article 3 itself.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Sir, as the Hon'ble Leader of the House wanted that I should make some remarks before he made a reply, I would like to say that I am very glad to do so and I must thank at the very outset my esteemed friend the Hon'ble Member Sri Rama Rao who has come to my rescue when I was unable to understand where I stood for more than 48 hours. Sir, I made it very clear how it was dangerous to have Part III containing these clauses 15 to 21. What was administratively possible by virtue of the provisions, particularly 258 and 263 of the Constitution to which I shall make reference on another occasion when I am trying to canvass support of this Hon'ble House to my another amendment, has now been sought to be done through this Bill. While it was always possible to make certain consultation under the Constitution, here we are asked to give legislative sanction to a thing against which a remedy could only be by parliamentary legislation. Sir, it is well understood that the provisions of the Constitution almost are or must appear to be sacrosanct so far as they went. But here is an attempt made for the first time by virtue of a Parliamentary Bill to make fundamental changes in the Constitution while at the same time holding this Constitution to be sacred. I pointed out this danger. Today my Hon'ble friend Sri Rama Rao in his own inimitable language and in a very clarificatory tone has made that point very clear and impressed the Hon'ble Members of the House and the Leader of the House. I really believe that he has converted them. When at first it looked as though my amendment would fall through and I was still in an uncertain position, the position has been fully clarified to my best advantage and I feel now that my amendment has better chances of acceptance by the House. Sir, I further said yesterday that even if you take away Part III from the Bill, it made no difference whatever to the Bill and the Bill does not suffer in any way. What is more, it is merely adding something which may not confer any additional power which, but for this Bill, would not have been exercised by any authority under the law as it stands today. That is what I made clear. I also said that it is nothing but a costly machinery which will not confer any additional benefits. Therefore I ask this House and particularly the Leader of the House to consider this request dispassionately. It looks to me that it is even possible that certain considerations which might weigh on certain minds, may be unconsciously, may help to thrash out the provisions as they are. So, I would beseech the Leader of the House: let us take the provisions of the Bill as they are, with no thought extraneous to it. I feel, Sir, it will not be wise at all at this stage to give legislative sanction to this idea of Zonal Councils in connection with the reorganisation of the States. I am even of the opinion that, having regard to the provisions of the Constitution, we should not even be asked to consider a matter like this before the Bill is sponsored in the Central Parliament. I am glad my friend Sri Rama Rao has so ably expounded the legal position that this has confirmed my view that the implementation of Part III of the Bill would be nothing but bringing into existence a costly machinery without any corresponding benefit accruing to the participating States. As I said, it will be a body without a soul and if there is no soul, we must put the soul into it. Even otherwise a spiritual shade devoid of this material body is equally of no value. So what I would suggest is that we must put soul into this body which is really what was needed. Unless that is done, it will be nothing but adding some more complications and the supervening of a costly machinery.

With these words, Sir, and generally adopting and reiterating, if I may say so, what I have already said by way of general remarks on the Bill and even yesterday when I was moving this amendment, I commend this amendment for the kind acceptance of the House.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, my Hon'ble friend Sri K. Pattabhiraman

knows how anxious I was to see his point of view. It is very rarely that a Leader of the House takes time to consider an amendment suggested by a person not belonging to the Treasury Benches as they say. That is enough compliment that has been paid to him.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Thank you for small mercies.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I find every Legislature in India passing this Part of the Bill even without much discussion.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Mysore must lead, is it not ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Saurashtra and Bombay Assemblies, the Madras Assembly, the Andhra Assembly, Punjab, PEPSU, all these Assemblies have already passed this Bill. This Bill does not require to be passed by the State Assemblies. Our views are being ascertained by the Centre. Therefore, much of our anxiety gets relieved when we realise that what we are expected to do is to express our views, not so much as to pass the Bill as it were in the sense in which that term is understood in constitutional language. Sri Rama Rao has made out a point. There is much force in it. This very Council may have been brought into existence under Article 263. I may straightaway say, Sir, I am not personally quite happy about the composition of these Councils, or their personnel or the functions entrusted to them. Nor am I satisfied, as Sri Rama Rao has pointed out, about the constitutional propriety also. But we need not think in terms of opposing or get into that mood and speak. What we are expected to do is to convey the views of this House. I undertake to convey to the Government of India the constitutional point of view raised and elaborated by my Hon'ble friend Sri Rama Rao. After all, Law is not decided by majority. Even if we accept by a majority an unconstitutional thing, it cannot be law. It cannot be enforced. Let us therefore communicate our views to the Government of India. I am sure they will examine it and if they find that this is not the way of constituting these Councils, they will certainly find out some other way which is in harmony with the Constitutional provisions.

In regard to the point of view of Sri Pattabhiraman, Sir, he knows the amendment raises two fundamental questions. One is that this Council should be entrusted with executive and administrative powers. Secondly that it should be entrusted with responsibility in regard to the Central Lists as is sought to be done with State Lists in the Bill. These are the two ideas with which opinion is still being shaped. In the Madras Council, eminent persons have taken different views in the matter. Shri C. Rajagopalachari wants that this Council should be a sort of Upper Chamber for the State Legislature of two or three States as the case may be. I have myself been unable to finally formulate the views for us to sponsor through this House. What is sought to be done through this Bill is merely to constitute a Council of an advisory character. Advice now-a-days does not mean much. It may be accepted or it may not be accepted. Therefore the Zonal Councils at any rate as they are to be constituted need not be taken so seriously. It may be in the process of working we shall be able to find lacuna or shortcomings. We may thereafter make suggestions to improve its effectiveness. Sir, in regard to increasing its scope for discussion I have myself tabled an amendment which I will presently move. There is not much difference between Sri Pattabhiraman's motion and mine in that regard. After careful deliberation, we have come to the conclusion that it will be too early to think of entrusting this Council with the administrative and executive powers. Many of my friends advised that this cannot be done by mere establishment of Zonal Councils. Constitutional amendments have to take place. Even as Sri Rama Rao pointed out, these Zonal Councils could be brought into existence in this way but preferably under article 263. Even so if they want this Council to be vested with administrative and executive jurisdiction pertaining to the State lists and Central lists, Constitutional

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

amendments are required. It cannot be done through this Bill. My friend Sri Pattabhiraman will therefore see that there is this difficulty of amending the Constitution also before we can get our suggestions and our ideas incorporated into this Bill. There is time. Let us all think over again and make fresh proposals to the Government of India. I am envisaging making these proposals not at a very distant future. Let us accept the idea of the Council. Sri Pattabhiraman wants it to be called as Pradesh Council; it has been called as Zonal Council in the Bill. Anyway the idea of having some sort of councils to regulate and improve the Inter-State relationship is accepted. Let us accept this new idea. I will also forward to the Government of India, along with the Bill that we have to send, a separate note on the constitutional point that has been raised by Sri Rama Rao and further about the advisability of entrusting executive and administrative powers to this Council. In the meanwhile, I request the House to accept the amendment I have proposed. These are merely the views that we express The other views also can be communicated. They cannot be communicated individually. I take the responsibility of enclosing these two Notes; when I send the opinions of the Assembly, these two Notes will also be sent for examination.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

2-30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 16. There is an amendment in the name of Sri Pattabhiraman.

SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Sir, I do not propose to move it.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment in the name of Sri Srinivasa Iyengar to clause 16.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T. Narsipur).—Sir, I move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b), for the words "two other Ministers", the words "two other members of the Legislature" shall be substituted."

Sir, clause 16 provides for the composition of the Council. It reads as follows:

"(b) the Chief Minister of each of the States included in the zone and two other Ministers of each such State to be nominated by the Governor;"

Even these Ministers have to be nominated by the Governor. If the amendment to this is accepted it will read as follows:

"The Chief Minister of each of the States included in the zone and two other members of the Legislature of each State to be nominated by the Governor."

Sir, the Cabinet works on the principle of joint responsibility. When the Chief Minister is a member of the Zonal Council, I feel that two other Ministers of the same Cabinet need not be there. Moreover, the Ministers are also members of this Legislature. Therefore, if the House is pleased to accept the amendment, we will be having a broader term. The Governor will have the scope to nominate any other two members—one from this House and one from the other House or the Ministers themselves. Why should we restrict the membership? I hope the Chief Minister will be glad to accept this amendment. I commend the amendment for the acceptance of the House...

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (*b*) for the words 'two other Ministers', the words 'two other Members of the Legislature' shall be substituted."

SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I support the amendment moved by my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar. While doing so, I wish to suggest that when nominating two other members of the Legislature to the Zonal Council, the Governor should take note to see that at least one member of the Opposition is included in this Zonal Council. . .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—To oppose what?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—We may oppose the Chief Minister here because he represents the ruling party. But, in the Zonal Council we will assist the Chief Minister and he will assist us in matters relating to the State; so there is additional force. We will represent Mysore's case with one voice. Therefore, I would suggest that while nominating two members to the Zonal Council, at least one member of the Opposition should be nominated.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I am unable to accept the amendment. My friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar is not clear in wording this amendment. He thinks that Ministers are a separate class. If this amendment is accepted, Governor may, instead of nominating two non-Ministers, nominate the Ministers themselves who fulfil the condition of Ministers being members of the Assembly. Besides, the idea of Zonal Council is quite different from the idea entertained by my Hon'ble friends. This Council is expected to work on Ministerial level. That is why all the members that are now proposed are either Ministers or permanent officers of Government of India or State Governments as the case may be. Therefore, the very conception is a sort of Ministerial Inter-State Advisory Committee. It does not partake the nature of a Legislature. Therefore, we cannot mix up ideas. The Zonal Council that is proposed to be constituted is of a different category and it is purely a Governmental one consisting of people who have got executive authority and not merely legislative authority. These two ideas cannot go together and therefore I am unable to accept the amendment.

*Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I press the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) (*b*), for the words 'two other Ministers' the words 'two other members of the Legislature' shall be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment in the name of the Chief Minister for clause 16.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

"That in sub-clause (4), in item (*c*), after the words 'Development Commissioners,' the words 'or any other Officer nominated by the State Government concerned' shall be inserted."

Sir, in fact, at a given time there may be an office whose designation is Development Commissioner or there may not be that office. The Madras Legislature has also adopted a similar amendment. The State Government concerned must be in a position to select a proper person. It is with a view to give scope for such a choice, this amendment is being moved.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in sub-clause (4), in item (*c*), after the words 'Development Commissioners,' the words 'or any other Officer nominated by the State Government concerned' shall be inserted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, clauses 17 to 20.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I think, yesterday I have spoken about this. I do not propose to move the amendment to clauses 17 to 20.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I want to speak on clause 19.

"Each Zonal Council shall have a Secretarial staff consisting of a Secretary, a Joint Secretary and such other officers as the Chairman may consider necessary to appoint."

"(2) The Chief Secretaries of the States represented in such Council shall each be the Secretary of the Council by rotation and hold office for a period of one year at a time."

Sir, I am afraid that in addition to the duties of the Chief Secretary of the State, it may not be possible for him to act as the Secretary of this Zonal

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

Council. The work will be hampered. Instead of the Chief Secretary of the State, if a permanent Secretary is appointed in consultation with the Chief Ministers who are members of the Zonal Council and the Central Government, it would be more appropriate. I therefore seek some clarification on this. I feel that this may not be of much use and some more useful way may be found out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Your views would be conveyed to the Centre. Now, clause 21.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—I move:

> 'That (1) in sub-clause (2), in item (a), the words "border disputes" shall be omitted and at the end of the item, the words "but excluding border disputes" shall be added.'
>
> '(2) After item (a), the following item shall be inserted namely:—
>
> "(aa) Matters relating to railways, posts and telegraphs, telephones, wireless and broadcasting, insurance, mining, major ports, civil aviation and location of basic and heavy industries;" '

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> 'That (1) in sub-clause (2), in item (a), the words "border disputes" shall be omitted and at the end of the item, the words "but excluding border disputes" shall be added.'
>
> '(2) After item (a), the following item shall be inserted namely:—
>
> "(aa) Matters relating to railways, posts and telegraphs, telephones, wireless and broad-casting, insurance, mining, major ports, civil aviation and location of basic and heavy industries;" '

The motion was adopted.

*Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I move:

> "After sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be added namely:—
>
> "(3) A report of the action taken by the State Government shall be sent to the Central Government for the purpose of placing it at the meeting of the Zonal Council."

In clause 21 there is provision for the functions of the Zonal Council and it says:

> "Each Zonal Council shall be an advisory body and may discuss any matter in which some or all of the States represented in that Council, or the Union and one or more of the States represented in that Council, have a common interest and advise the Central Government and the Government of each State concerned as to the action to be taken on any such matter."

There is a provision like that. If the recommendations of the Zonal Council are sent to the respective Governments, I thought it would be better if the Zonal Council knows what has happened to those recommendations. Therefore, I have placed this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

> "After sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be added, namely:—
>
> "(3) A report of the action taken by the State Governments shall be sent to the Central Government for the purpose of placing it at the meeting of the Zonal Council."

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—There is no necessity for such an amendment. When there is a Council, it is implicit in their proceedings that they will know what is being done with reference to the decision already taken. Therefore, it need not be incorporated.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Then I do not press.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 42. Sri K. Puttaswamy.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—Sir, I beg to move:

"In sub-clause (1) (*a*) of clause 42, the words 'were associate members nominated under section 5 of the former Act and ' shall be deleted."

Clause 42(1 (*a*) deals with the associate members for purposes of delimitation of constituencies after new States are formed. The object is made clear in paragraph 27 on page 7 dealing with delimitation of constituencies. According to clause 42 (*a*),—five persons out of the members who were associated with the previous Delimitation Commission have to be selected by the Central Government. In order to avoid delay, the Central Government proposes to select five out of the associate members who served as associate members previously. The amendment that I am moving is for the deletion of the words 'were associate members nominated under section 5 of the former Act'." If this is accepted, clause 42 (1) (*a*) would read thus :

"......the Commission shall associate with itself in respect of each new State such five persons as the Central Government shall by order specify, being persons—

(*a*) who are members either of the House of the People or of a State Legislative Assembly. . . ."

The object of my amendment is to see that the selection is made amongst the members of the House of the People or of the Legislative Assembly of a State. As it is, the selection is confined to members who were members associated with the previous Delimitation Commission. I am moving this amendment to see that the selection is in a wider field, that is, amongst the members of the Legislative Assembly or of the House of the people. As it would not in any way cause delay, I feel that it would not come in the way of the object of the Draft Bill if this amendment is accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"In sub-clause (1) (*a*), the words ' were associate members nominated under section 5 of the former Act and ' shall be deleted."

*ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಡಿಲಿಮಿಟೇಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವರೇ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಆ ಡೀಲಿಮಿಟೇಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಈ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಚುನಾವಣಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸುವ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈವರೆಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅನುಭವ ಸಹ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಮಹಾ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಕಾಲ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸಮೀಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. 56-57ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮತ್ತೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಹೀಗೆ ಕಾಲ ಸಮೀಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಹೊಸ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕೆಲಸದ ಅನುಭವವೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಪುನಃ ಈ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳ ಶೇಖರಣೆಗೆ ಹೊರಟರೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೊಸ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕನ್ನು ಹಿಯರ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲೇ ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಹಾರೂಪದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೇ ಇವರು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಶೇಖರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇವರನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೇ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ತಾವು ಹಾಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಗಳಿಗೇ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Whether members are new or old, constituencies have to be freshly delimited. What Sri Puttaswamy proposes to do is, those people who did it on the previous occasion need not be there ; let there be a fresh committee. There is no objection. I support the amendment and I accept it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"In sub-clause (1) (*a*), the words ' were associate members nominated under section 5 of the former Act and ' shall be deleted".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now Clause 61.

***Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.**—Sir, I move :

"For sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2) All proceedings pending in the High Court of Hyderabad immediately before the appointed day, as have not been certified under sub-section (2) of sectoin 55 or sub-section (2) of section 58. shall, as from the appointed day, stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra."

The reason for moving the amendment is this. These clauses provide for transfer of proceedings pending in the High Court of Hyderabad on the certification of the Chief Justice of that High Court to the High Court of Bombay, the High Court of Mysore and the High Court of Andhra. The High Court of Hyderabad ceases to exist as from the appointed day. Though the provision is made for certification of the Chief Justice of the High Court of Hyderabad for a transfer of pending proceedings to the High Courts of Bombay, Andhra and Mysore, it is possible that some of the pending cases may escape such certification. In that event the problem may arise as to which of the existing High Courts should have jurisdiction in respect of such proceedings. In order to obviate such difficulties, it is suggested that all pending proceedings which are not certified by the Chief Justice of Hyderabad for being transferred to the High Courts of Bombay and Mysore, should as from the appointed day stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra-Telangana. For this purpose, this amendment is moved, in order to fill up the lacuna.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'For sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2) All proceedings pending in the High Court of Hyderabad immediately before the appointed day, as have not been certified under sub-section (2) of section 55 or sub-section (2) of section 58, shall, as from the appointed day, stand transferred to the High Court of Andhra."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 66.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—With respect to clause 66, I am not moving the amendment proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 70.

***Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.**—Sir, I move :

'After clause 70, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"70-A. Expenditure on account of the formation of new States.—(1) Any expenditure to be incurred by a new State on account of the formation of that State shall, to the extent certified by the Comptroller and Auditor General as expenditure attributable to the formation of such State be charged on the Consolidated Fund of India.

(2) Pending the apportionment of the assets and liabilities under Parts VII and VIII the Central Government shall, immediately after the appointed day, make such ways and means advances free of interest to every new State as may be necessary to carry on the administration of such State."'

The very phraseology is self explanatory. It may be accepted by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'After clause 70, the following clause shall be inserted, namely :—

"70-A. Expenditure on account of the formation of new States.—(1) Any expenditure to be incurred by a new State on account of the formation of that State shall, to the extent certified by the Comptroller and Auditor General as expenditure attributable to the formation of such State, be charged on the Consolidated Fund of India.

"(2) Pending the appointment of the assets and liabilities under Parts VII and VIII the Central Government shall, immediately after the appointed day, make such ways and means advances free of interest to every new State as may be necessary to carry on the administration of such State." '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 71 and 72.

*Sri J. MOHAMEDIMAM (Jagalur).—I have to make a few observations on clauses 71 and 72. These two clauses relate to apportionment of assets and liabilities between the State of Mysore and other States. In this respect, I would like to know what arrangements have been made. We had bitter experience in the past. When Bellary was transferred from Madras, it was very unhappy. There was a clause that stipulated that all the money that would be available in the treasuries of the transferred area would go to Mysore. The Chief Minister made a statement that on that day he found all the treasuries in Bellary District empty. There is also a good deal of confusion regarding the transfer of assets from Bellary area to others. All the Hon'ble Members know how an attempt was made to smuggle machinery and other things from the Tungabhadra to Andhra area without the concurrence of Mysore and that was also brought to the notice of this House. I am anxious you must take every possible precaution. I do not doubt the sincerity and anxiety of the neighbouring Government, but we must be very careful regarding the apportionment of assets and liabilities. I know the Government has appointed a special officer to look into all these matters. Here one clause stipulates that whatever money is available in the local treasuries on the appointed day would come to Mysore. It may be before the appointed day all the moneys in these treasuries are transferred to other treasuries out of necessity or it may be that many valuable assets are also transferred. So I would like to know on what basis there will be the apportionment of assets and liabilities and what precautions have the Government of Mysore taken and whether any arrangement has been made to safeguard the interests of Mysore. I would like to seek some information on this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How is it possible now even for the Government. . . .

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—They must have taken some precautions.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಪಾಸಾದನಂತರ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಒಂದೊಂದೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿದಂಥ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗೂಟ, ಒಂದು ಕ್ಯಾಲೆಂಡರ್, ಒಂದು ಮೊಳೆ ಸಹ ಬಿಡದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಿತ್ತು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದ ಸಮಾಚಾರ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮಗೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದುದ್ದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ವರ್ತನೆಗಳು ಈಗಲೂ ಸಹ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉಂಟಾಗಬಹುದು. ಬಿದರೆ, ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ತಯಾರಾಗುವುದರೊಳಗಾಗಿಯೇ ತಾವು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳ, ಹಣ ಕಾಸುಗಳ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯನ್ನೂ ಈಗಲೇ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

3 P.M.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Hon'ble Members have raised a very important issue. It is our duty to see that assets and liabilities are divided on a just and fair basis. Sir, the example of Bellary is a bad example. The feelings in that area ran so high that very many undesirable things have taken place. I am certain that in this reorganisation, division of assets and liabilities will take place in a cool and calm atmosphere. In any case we have to watch what our assets are and determine what our liabilities are. For this purpose, as the House is aware, the Government have already appointed a Special Secretary. The second step we have taken is, we have appointed a committee of Secretaries. They are at work. I have been requested by the representatives of Bombay Karnataka and Hyderabad Karnataka to take further steps. I also

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

consulted the Chief Minister of Coorg. He has also agreed to the suggestion. The Mysore Government is therefore proposing to appoint a Committee at the Ministerial level to periodically meet, exchange ideas and take what is called a united stand. Unless a Committee at the Ministerial level is appointed, it would not be possible to know exactly what has to be done. It may not be possible for us to know facts and figures relating to our assets and liabilities. In the Bombay cabinet and in the Madras cabinet there are Ministers who represent those areas. The Coorg Government has its own Ministry. I propose to constitute a Committee of these Ministers at a very early date in order to safeguard the assets and also determine the liabilities, in a proper manner, of the new State of Mysore.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—On a point of information, Sir. A few days ago a joint committee of Maharashtra and Gujerat was formed to apportion the assets and liabilities as between Maharashtra and Gujerat. I want to know whether any representative of Mysore Government has been included.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I have ascertained and Sri Patil is in that committee.

A MEMBER.—Does he represent Mysore?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will adjourn and meet at 3-30 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 73.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

"For the words 'cash balances in all treasuries' the words 'cash balances excluding the amounts to be transferred to the successor States under sections 79 and 80 in all treasuries' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"For the words 'cash balances in all treasuries' the words 'cash balances excluding the amounts to be transferred to the successor States under sections 79 and 80 in all treasuries' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 76.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I beg to move:

"For the words 'the general fund', the words 'all other funds' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"For the words 'the general fund', the words 'all other funds' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 78.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I have an amendment to clause 78. And the Government also have an amendment to that clause. Shall I move my amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

*Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I move:

"In sub-clause (1), for the word 'and' between the words 'Bombay' and 'Hyderabad' the comma ',' shall be substituted and after the word 'Hyderabad' the words 'and Mysore' shall be inserted.

In sub-clause, (3), for the word 'or' between the words 'Bombay' and 'Hyderabad' the comma ',' shall be substituted and after the word 'Hyderabad' the words 'or Mysore' shall be inserted.

In the proviso to sub-clause (3), after the word 'assets' the words "booked under the heading 'Expenditure outside the revenue account' shall be inserted."

Sir, Clause 78 of the Bill provides for the adjustment of public debt. According to this clause :

"The public debt of each of the existing States of Bombay and Hyderabad attributable to loans raised by the issue of Government securities and outstanding with the public immediately before the 30th day of September 1956, shall as from that day be the debt of the Union, and immediately on such transfer of the debt, the Central Government shall be deemed to have made a loan to that State of an amount equal to the debt so transferred on the same terms in regard to interest and repayment as are applicable to the loans so raised by that State."

On the appointed day the new State will come into existence. The territories that exist in the State of Mysore will not be there. A new State comprising the territories of the existing State of Mysore, some areas of the existing State of Hyderabad, the existing State of Bombay and State of Madras will be formed into one State as contained in clause 7. My idea is when the public debt of the Government of Bombay and the Government of Hyderabad is going to be taken over by the Centre, the public debt of the existing State of Mysore may also be taken over by the Centre and allotment to the respective States be done according to para (3) of clause 78. The amendment to para (3) is of a consequential nature.

There is a proviso to sub-clause (3) of clause 78. It reads as follows :—

"Provided that for the purposes of such division only expenditure on assets for which capital accounts have been kept shall be taken into account."

My amendment says, in the proviso to sub-clause (3), after the word 'assets' the words 'booked under the heading Expenditure outside the Revenue Account' shall be inserted. I mean this. Under the P. W. D. Code, in the case of certain works estimated to cost over and above a particular amount capital account is to be maintained. It is possible that such a work might have been financed from the revenue surpluses, or from loans raised outside the revenue account. So, if certain works for which capital account has been maintained, had been financed from revenue surpluses, why should we share loans on that account? Therefore while taking such works into consideration, we should see that the works for which capital accounts are maintained and financed outside the revenue account alone should be taken. That is all.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Since Government has framed an amendment and it contains a little more clarification than Sri Srinivasa Iyengar's amendment, I request the Hon'ble Member to allow my amendment to be passed.

My amendment is as follows :—

"(1) In sub-clause (1), for the words 'States of Bombay and Hyderabad', the words 'States of Bombay, Mysore and Hyderabad' shall be substituted.

(2) In sub-clause (3), after the words 'capital outlays incurred', the words 'out of the said loans' shall be inserted; and in the proviso, after the words 'capital accounts have been kept', the words 'and booked outside the Revenue Account' shall be inserted.

(3) After sub-clause (4), the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely :—

'(4-A). Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding sub-sections any amount received as loans raised by the issue of Government securities by any existing State after the first day of April, 1956, and before the appointed day, shall be divided between the successor States according to the population ratio.'"

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment of the Leader of the House to vote. The question is:

"(1) In sub-clause (1), for the words 'States of Bombay and Hyderabad' the words 'States of Bombay, Mysore and Hyderabad' shall be substituted.

(2) In sub-clause (3), after the words 'capital outlays incurred'; the words 'out of the said loans' shall be inserted; and in the proviso, after the words 'capital accounts have been kept', the words 'and booked outside the Revenue Account' shall be inserted.

(3) After sub-clause (4), the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely:—

'(4.A).-Not withstanding anything contained in the preceding sub-sections any amount received as loans raised by the issue of Government securities by any existing State after the first day of April 1956, and before the appointed day, shall be divided between the successor States according to the population ratio.'"

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Srinivasa Iyengar's amendment is almost the same as the Government amendment. There is no necessity therefore to put it. Now Clause 79.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"At the end of the clause, the words 'but an amount equal to the said liability shall be transferred to the successor State' shall be added."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"At the end of the clause, the words 'but an amount equal to the said liability shall be transferred to the successor State' shall be added."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 80.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"At the end of the clause, the words 'but an amount equal to the said liability shall be transferred to the successor State' shall be added."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"At the end of the clause, the words 'but an amount equal to the said liability shall be transferred to the successor State' shall be added."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 82.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Clause 82 relates to contracts. And we have clarified the situation so far as the State is concerned. I move the amendment:

"(1) In item (c) of sub-clause (1), for the words 'of the principal successor State', the words 'of all successor States' shall be substituted.

(2) After item (c), the following proviso shall be inserted:—

'Provided that nothing in clause (c) shall apply to any successor State which has no right or liability under the contract;'

(3) In the existing proviso to sub-clause (1), for the words 'Provided that', the words 'Provided also that' shall be substituted, and for the words 'as the Central Government may, by order, direct', the words as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine', shall be substituted".

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"(1) In item (c) of sub-clause (1), for the words 'of the principal successor State' the words 'of all successor States' shall be substituted.

(2) After item (c), the following proviso shall be inserted:—

'Provided that nothing in clause (c) shall apply to any successor State which has no right or liability under the contract;'

(3) In the existing proviso to sub-clause (1), for the words 'Provided that', the words 'Provided also that' shall be substituted, and for the words 'as the Central Government may, by order, direct', the words 'as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine', shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 83.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I move :

'That in item (*c*) for the words "as the Central Government may by order direct", the words "as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine" shall be substituted.'

Sir, these amendments to clauses 82,83 and 86 are all relating to contracts and actionable wrongs. Therefore, they are consequential.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in item (*c*), for the words "as the Central Government may by order direct", the words "as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 85-A.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That after clause 85, the following clause shall be inserted, namely :—

"85-A. *Investments in and advances to statutory bodies.*—Save as otherwise provided in the preceding sections of this Part, all investments in and advances to statutory bodies made by an existing State shall pass to the successor State, or if there be two or more successor States, be divided between them according to the population ratio." '

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That after clause 85, the following clause shall be inserted, namely :—

"85-A. *Investments in and advances to statutory bodies* :—Save as otherwise provided in the preceding sections of this Part, all investments in and advances to statutory bodies made by an existing State shall pass to the successor State, or if there be two or more successor States, be divided between them according to the population ratio." '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 86.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That (1) Clause 86 shall be renumbered as sub-clause (1) of that clause, and in item (b) of that sub-clause, for the words "as the Central Government may by order direct", the words, "as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine" shall be substituted.

(2) After sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be added, namely :—

"(2) All arrears of pay, allowance, grants-in-aid to institutions and local bodies, bills for services rendered and supplies made for any period prior to the appointed day shall be adjusted in the accounts for September, 1956, of the existing States." '

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That (1) Clause 86 shall be renumbered as sub-clause (1) of that clause, and in item (b) of that sub-clause, for the words "as the Central Government may by order direct", the words "as an Arbitrator to be appointed by the Chief Justice of India may determine," shall be substituted.

(2) After sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be added, namely :—

"(2) All arrears of pay, allowance, grants-in-aid to institutions and local bodies, bills for services rendered and supplies made for any period prior to the

(MR. SPEAKER.)

appointed day shall be adjusted in the accounts for September, 1956, of the existing States." '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 90.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That in item (a) the words "within an existing State" shall be omitted; and for the words "governance of that State", the words "governance of an existing State" shall be substituted.'

In this clause provision is made for the transferance of the Assets of the Union within an existing Part 'C' State to the successor State. The provision as it exists may not cover Bank balances, accounts or deposits which may happen to be outside that State. It is proposed to amend Clause 90 so as to include such amounts that may be outside the State. It is possible that the Coorg State may have Bank accounts in Bangalore and the provision as it exists may not cover such amounts. This amendment is similar to the amendment proposed to Clause 86.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in item (a) the words "within an existing State" shall be omitted; and for the words "governance of that State", the words "governance of an existing State shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 97.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That in sub-clauses (2) and (3), for the words "as the Central Government may by order determine", the words "as such State will be entitled to on the basis of the population ratio" shall be substituted.'

These provisions relate to certain State Financial Corporations.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clauses (2) and (3), for the words "as the Central Government may by order determine", the words "as such State will be entitled to on the basis of the population ratio" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 98.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That in sub-clause (2) for the words "as the Central Government may by order determine", the words "as each such State will be entitled to on the basis of the population ratio" shall be substituted.'

It relates to the provisions as to the Madras Industrial Corporation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clause (2) for the words "as the Central Government may by order determine", the words "as each such State will be entitled to on the basis of the population ratio" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 100.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

'That (1) at the end of sub-clause (2), the words "for the purpose of facilitating the proper functioning of the Board" shall be added ; and

(2) in item (b) of sub-clause (3), after the words "if no agreement is reached", the words "within one year from the date of dissolution" shall be inserted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That (1) at the end of sub-clause (2), the words "for the purpose of facilitating the proper functioning of the Board" shall be added ; and

(2) in item (b) of sub-clause (3), after the words "if no agreement is reached", the words "within one year from the date of dissolution" shall be inserted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 101.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

'That after the words, "the Central Government may", the words, "after consultation with the State Governments concerned," shall be inserted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That after the words "the Central Government may" the words "after consultation with the State Governments concerned," shall be inserted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 102.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

'That (1) in sub-clause (1) for the word "April" the word "October" shall be substituted; and

(2) In sub-clause (2), after the words "the distribution of benefits to be derived from it shall" the words "if such scope or such provisions have been agreed to before the appointed day by the Governments of such existing States" shall be inserted.'

Clause 102(1) relates to the continuance of agreements and arrangements in regard to certain irrigation power and multi-purpose projects. In sub-clause (1) the existing provision provides for agreement to be arrived at between the Central Government and the successor State concerned or between the successor States by the first day of April 1957. As this period is too short, it is proposed that it may be substituted by "first day of October, 1957". This is the outer time that has been fixed. If they come to an agreement earlier, there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That (1) in sub-clause (1), for the word "April" the word "October' shall be substituted; and (2) in sub-clause (2), after the words "the distribution of benefits to be derived from it shall" the words "if such scope or such provisions have been agreed to before the appointed day by the Governments of such existing States" shall be inserted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 103.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

'That in sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government may" the words "after consultation with the State Governments concerned" shall be inserted.'

This relates to the Bombay Transport Corporation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'That in sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government may" the words "after consultation with the State Governments concerned" shall be inserted.'

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I would like to have a clarification, Sir. Bombay State has a corporation which runs the bus transport, and it has spread throughout the Bombay State. What will be the position of this Bus transport regarding the four districts that will be transferred to the State of Mysore? This clause gives an idea that the same corporation will continue and that it will continue to operate buses in that area. It requires further examination.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—We will examine the position.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'In sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government may" the words "after consultation with the State Governments concerned", shall be inserted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 103-A.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That after clause 103, the following new clause shall be inserted, namely—

"103—A.—*Provisions as to State Housing Boards.*—The Housing Boards established for any existing State shall as from the appointed day continue to function and operate in those areas in respect of which it was functioning and operating immediately before that day subject to the provisions of sub-section (3) and to such directions as may, from time to time, be issued by the Central Government.

(2) Any directions issued by the Central Government under sub-section (1) in respect of any Housing Board shall include a direction that any law by which the said Board is governed shall in its application to that Board have effect subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the direction.

(3) The Housing Board continued under sub-section (1) shall cease to function and shall be deemed to be dissolved on the first day of April 1957 or such earlier date as the Central Government may after consultation with the States concerned by order appoint.

(4) On such dissolution, the assets and liabilities of the said Housing Boards shall be apportioned between the successor States according to the population ratio."

There is a Housing Board in Bombay State. The position with regard to the Bombay State is not known. The existing provisions do not provide for the division of Assets and Liabilities of Housing Boards wherever they exist. A new Clause 103 (A) is therefore proposed in which provision is made for the continuance of the Housing Boards of the existing States till 1st April 1957 and for the dissolution of the said Boards after that date and the division of Assets and Liabilities between the successor States according to the population ratio.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That after clause 103, the following new clause shall be inserted, namely—

"103—A.—*Provisions as to State Housing Boards.*—The Housing Boards established for any existing State shall as from the appointed day continue to function and operate in those areas in respect of which it was functioning and operating immediately before that day subject to the provisions of sub-section (3) and to such directions as may, from time to time, be issued by the Central Government.

(2) Any directions issued by the Central Government under sub-section (1) in respect of any Housing Board shall include a direction that any law by which the said Board is governed shall in its application to that Board have effect subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the direction.

(3) The Housing Board continued under sub-section (1) shall cease to function and shall be deemed to be dissolved on the first day of April 1957 or such earlier date as the Central Government may after consultation with the States concerned by order appoint.

(4) On such dissolution, the assets and liabilities of the said Housing Boards shall be apportioned between the successor States according to the population ratio.".'

The motion was adopted.

4 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 105.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I move :

'For the figures and words "31st day of December, 1956" the figures and words "1st day of April 1957" shall be substituted.'

Clause 105 which pertains to the continuance of facilities in certain State institutions provides the 31st Day of December 1956 as the limit of time by which the State Governments concerned should come to an agreement as regards the terms and conditions on which the facilities should be provided. It is considered that this is too short a period. Hence the amendment is proposed to substitute "First Day of April 1957" for "31st Day of December, 1956".

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'For the figures and words "31st Day of December, 1956", the figures and words "1st day of April 1957" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 106.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

'To sub-clause (4), the following proviso shall be added, namely:

"Provided that in the case of an existing State, which has only one successor State, the personnel of the cadre of the existing State shall be allotted only to the cadre of such successor State."'

This clause relates to the provisions regarding the All-India Services. The amendment is proposed to this clause to the effect that where there is only one successor State (as in the case of Mysore) to any existing State, then, the personnel of the cadre of that existing State should be allotted only to the cadre of the successor State. That is to say, the officers of the existing Mysore State should not be allotted to some other State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'To sub-clause (4), the following proviso shall be added, namely:—

"Provided that in the case of an existing State, which has only one successor State, the personnel of the cadre of the existing State shall be allotted only to the cadre of such successor State."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 107.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

'(1) In sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government shall", the words "in consultation with the State Governments concerned" shall be inserted; and

(2) in sub-clause (5), after item (a), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(aa) the removal of inequalities and anomalies in the scales of pay and allowances of persons affected by the provisions of this section;"

(3) Proviso to sub-clause (7) shall be omitted.'

This clause relates to other services of the States concerned. Amendments are proposed to this Clause to bring within its scope the removal of inequalities and anomalies in the scale of pay and allowances of service personnel with reference to the scale of pay and allowances of service personnel of other States that get allotted to the successor State.

A minor amendment has been proposed to provide for consultation of the States concerned by the Central Government.

"Proviso to sub-clause (7) shall be omitted". Sir, this is the most important amendment that we are handling. We have been discussing, Sir, that the pay structure of the new State should be in proportion to the income that this new State is likely to earn through various sources like taxation, through industrial concerns, etc. Here, in the proviso it says:

"Provided that the conditions of service applicable immediately before the appointed day to the case of any person who is required under this section to serve, as from that day, in connection with the affairs of any State shall not be varied to his disadvantage except with the previous approval of the Central Government."

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

If this proviso is allowed to remain, very serious financial responsibilities ensue. Then, the highest pay structure that exists in Bombay will have to be maintained and the pay structures that are existing in Mysore State, Coorg and Madras will have to be increased to that level. If that is done, probably the new State will have to bear an additional responsibility of about six to seven crores—I do not know how much. Even if the recommendations of Mascarenhas Committee are given effect to, it involves an additional expenditure of two crores; this will be below that of Bombay. You will, therefore, see, Sir, if this clause is accepted as it is, we will be in a financial coup. Most of the earnings of the State will have to be earmarked for the services or we have to increase the taxation structure to the highest level that obtains either in Bombay or Madras. What I am seeking to do now through this amendment is to vest the discretion in this House to decide as to how far to tax the new State and how far we could go in meeting the demand of these officers. By the mere deletion of this clause it does not mean that we are going to make the service personel suffer. But, we cannot, at the same time, give a blank cheque at the eve of the formation of the new State. What is sought to be done, is, to keep the discretion and the final decision in the hands of this House and then take the full picture into consideration about the resources, our income and how far we could afford to increase the scales of pay. Then we can come to any just decision which we may think fit. This proviso seeks to take away that discretion from this House and commit us to an expenditure which ultimately we cannot afford to meet. That is the significance of this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'(1) In sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government shall", the words "in consultation with the State Governments concerned" shall be inserted; and

(2) In sub-clause (5), after item (a), the following item shall be inserted, namely :—

"(aa) the removal of inequalities and anomalies in the scales of pay and allowances of persons affected by the provisions of this section;".

(3) Proviso to sub-clause (7) shall be omitted.'

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಉಳಿದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಿಂದ ಬರುವ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೌಕರರು ಬಹಳ ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ, ತ್ಯಾಗ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯಿಂದ, ಎಷ್ಟೋ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿ, 'ಕಡಮೆ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಹಳ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬಂದು ಮಾಸ್ಕರೇನ್‌ಹ್ಯಾಸ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ಕೂಡ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ವರದಿ ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈಲಿದೆ. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನಿಸಿದರು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಬರುವವರು ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಗೊಂದಲ ಎಬ್ಬಿಸಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಲ್ಲಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಬಳದ ಸ್ಕೇಲನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಬಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸ್ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ಇತರ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 500ಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರರಷ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಖಿಲಭಾರತ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ಸಹ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೆ ನಮ್ಮವರು ವಿಫಲರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು, ಅದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಶಿಫಾರ್ಸುಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂಥಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಇಡೀ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ ಅವಸ್ಥೆ, ಸುಮಾರು 50ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ನಾನ್‌ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳ ಅವಸ್ಥೆ ಮುಂದೇನಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, this is not an occasion to make

a general speech, sympathising with people whom my Hon'ble friend is not in a position to help. The central idea is whether this House should have the discretion or not in the matter of fixing the scales of pay. This is not a time for oration in favour of non-gazetted officers of the State.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—It is a question of guaranteeing the salary and pay structure and the Government of India have a responsibility in the matter; that is why that clause has been put in here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The amendment seeks to give the power into the hands of this House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಗೆ ಮೀರಿದ್ದು. ನಮ್ಮ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಯಂತೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 107ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ 5ನೆಯ ಸಬ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ (b) ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ "the proper integration of the services and their division among the existing States of Andhra and Madras and the new States" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಂಟಿಗ್ರೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರ್ವಿಸಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಅಂದರೆ. ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳವರು ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಖಂಡಿತ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜು ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೇ ಇರಲಿ, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

***Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—I rise to oppose the amendment. Sir, this chapter is very important because it concerns the services and service conditions of the Government personnel. Advisedly the Government of India have provided this proviso in this Bill. The States Reorganisation Commission, in their report on page 218 have said:

> "810. The integration of services which will follow the determination of the cadres and the allotment of personnel should be based on definite principles which should, as far as possible, be of uniform application throughout India. Some of the principles which seem *prima facie* to be suitable are that seniority among the officers in the State of original interest should not be disturbed and that the existing scales of pay and conditions of service should not be varied to the disadvantage of those who are now in employment, and should be continued until such time as uniform pay scales, not less advantageous than those enjoyed by them in the parent State, are evolved. It is also of the greatest importance that the body constituted to integrate the service personnel of the different States should be such as to inspire confidence and that only one appeal from a decision regarding integration should be permitted."

Time and again we have made representations that the salaries of Government servants belonging to the Central Government are so high when compared with the salaries of the State Government servants that it has created great disparity and this is causing discontentment among the services and to a certain extent inefficiency also.

And in the letter to the Government of India, the Government of Mysore have pleaded that this disability should cease or it should be narrowed down. It is not only the State of Mysore that is interested in the services but also the other States, the other areas. As far as possible, if there are no uniform scales of pay for service personnel excepting for areas where the cost of living is very high as in Bombay, Calcutta or Delhi, there will not be any desire or promptness on the part of the services to work in the best interests of the State and that is why the Government of India have advisedly provided this proviso so that the scales of pay should as far as possible be uniform and that a living wage should be given to the service personnel. What Sri Hutchie Gowda was pleading was that the scales of pay that we have been paying, that we have allowed to the service personnel in Mysore are below the living wage level. I must point out that there are certain things which the Government of Mysore have not done regarding the service personnel in Mysore State. Gradation lists have

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

not been prepared in various departments, seniorities have not been fixed. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Can we discuss that under this clause ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am discussing on this clause as well as on this chapter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You should not go far beyond these clauses.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—This Chapter deals not only with the scales of pay and the integration of services, but the Government of India is also contemplating to appoint a high power body which will go into this matter and fix up seniority of the service personnel. What I would like to bring to the notice of the House is, many of our officers and officials have not been confirmed in the places to which they are entitled and their seniorities have not been fixed and when integration of services takes place after the new State is formed should our officials suffer on account of the non-compliance. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why they want to take power under this clause to set right all these things.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—That is one point. Next, the scales of pay allowed to the service personnel in other areas that are coming into Mysore are a little bit high. There is no doubt about it, but it is considered to be the minimum living wage in the eyes of the Government of India. They do not want to say that their scales of pay are varied to the disadvantage of the service personnel. Though you like to give a guarantee by deleting this proviso you will not be giving any guarantee to those persons coming into Mysore State. This proviso is absolutely necessary in the interests of the service personnel and when you say that it will be incumbent on the part of the Mysore Government to increase the salaries of the Mysore Government service personnel to the levels that are prevailing in other areas. If necessary, they may have another amendment clause which will empower the State Governments to have consultations with the Central Government. Instead of leaving the entire matter to the Central Government in this regard, the State Governments may be consulted while giving their decision. I therefore oppose the amendment.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾದಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನ್‌ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕರು ಪದೇಪದೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ತನಕ ನಾನಾದರೋ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಸದುದ್ದೇಶ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆನು. ಆದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನ್‌ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ನೌಕರರ ಒಂದು ವಾರ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ "ಬಡನೌಕರ" ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಮೊದಲಿನ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲೇ "ಇನ್ನೇನು ಜನರಲ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಹತ್ತಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟು ಚುನಾವಣಾ ಮತದಾರರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಡ ನೌಕರರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇವರ ಕುಟುಂಬಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಟ್ಟಾದರೆ ಇವರೇ ಶೇಕಡಾ ಐದರಷ್ಟೋ ಅಥವಾ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟೋ ಮತದಾರರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಹಳ ಹುಷಾರಾಗಿರಿ" ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕಾ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಓದಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬಹುದು. . . .

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I must very strongly protest against the insinuation that is tried to be made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. I must own that whenever we plead, we plead for the justness of the cause, for the rightness of the cause and not to please the gallery as the Chief Minister has been doing in certain respects and I may tell him that I have not read that "Bada Naukara"; I have not seen that paper.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಆದುದರಿಂದ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬಂದಿದೆ. "ನೀವೇನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಓಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನೇ ಬಿಡೋಣವೋ!" ಎಂಬ ಸವಾಲು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಾನೇ ಒಂದು ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮಗೊಳಿಸೋಣ ಈ ದಿವಸ ರೈತನ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರಮಾನವೇನಿದೆ, ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಆದಾಯವೇನಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನೌಕರ ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರಮಾನವೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ವರಮಾನದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಸರಿಸಮಾನವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆನು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ಮಹನೀಯರು ಈ ಬಡನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾಲದು, ಇವರಿಗೆ ನೀವು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಬಳ ಏತಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾಲದು ಎಂದು ವಾದಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇವರು ಈ

ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಾನೇ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ನೋಡಿ. ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಒಬ್ಬ ಜವಾನನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವಂಥ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಎರಡನೇ ದರ್ಜೆಯ ನೌಕರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪದವೀಧರನಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವಿಲೀನೀಕರಣವಾದ ನಂತರ ನಾನಾ ಸ್ಟೇಟುಗಳಿಂದ ನಾನಾ ಆದಾಯ ಬಾಬುಗಳು ಅವರ ಕೈ ಸೇರಿದವು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಈಗ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳು ಇತರ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳ ನೌಕರರುಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಪುನಃ ಆ ಗಾಡ್ಗಿಲ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೇಳಿರಬೇಕು. ಆ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೊಡನೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿ ನೀವು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆನು. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಇತರ ಪ್ರಾಂತೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಅಂತರವುಂಟಾಗಿ ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮೂಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಹ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದ್ದಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ಈವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೂಡ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. 1952 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 'ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸ್' ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸಿನ ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾರತಾದ್ಯಂತವೂ ನೌಕರ ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದಿತು. ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲಾಚಾರಿಯವರೇ ಆ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷತೆಯನ್ನು ಆಗ ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ದಿವಸ ನಾನು ಈ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಜವಾನನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಎರಡನೆಯ ದರ್ಜೆ ನೌಕರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪದವೀಧರನಿಗೆ ಸಹ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದುದಕ್ಕೆ—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಈ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ನೆಪದಿಂದಲೋ ಏನೋ ಆ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸನ್ನೇ ಳಿದವ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಅವರು ಕರೆದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬೇ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರೈಮ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ನೆಹರೂಅವರು, I have been often telling him personally. He is not merely the Prime Minister of the Government of India, but he is the Prime Minister of India as a whole. He has sponsored the ideal of socialistic pattern of society. He is advocating what is called equality between individual and individual. If he does not see this glaring disparity between the scales of pay of the officials of the Central Government and of the officials of the State Government and remedy it, he is not true to his faith. That is a warning I want to give on behalf of this House and the Government of Mysore. If this amendment is not accepted, the autho'ity vests in the Central Government, according to my friend. Very good. If my amendment is accepted by this House, if to-morrow the Government of India does not approve of it, the responsibility is theirs. We can tell them : 'We wanted to have our own scales of pay. Since you want it to be increased, and since our resources are poor, you pay it, you give subvention to the State for that purpose.' There will be very good ground for us to make such a demand. On the other hand, if we give a blank cheque to the Central Government, they will say 'You yourselves agreed that the Central Government must guarantee pay structure at higher levels; you pay for it.' Therefore it is not a matter of sympathising with this class of Government servants or that class of Government servants. It is a question of finding resources and to find resources we have to tax the already taxed man in the village and in the town for the purpose of paying more to the officials. This we have to take into consideration. I am also moving another amendment in respect of clause 109 and I propose that it may be deleted. I will come to that later. Either the Central Government must allow us the discretion to have our own scales of pay and our own taxation structure or they must shoulder the additional burden which entails when we increase the pay scales. Therefore we shall now request the Central Government by this amendment to give us

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.)

discretion and responsibility. If tomorrow they do not give us the discretion and responsibility, then we will be on very good ground to ask them: 'You bear the extra expenditure; otherwise we cannot'.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'(1) In sub-clause (3), after the words "the Central Government shall", the words "in consultation with the State Governments concerned" shall be inserted; and

(2) in sub-clause (5), after item (a), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(aa) the removal of inequalities and anomalies in the scales of pay and allowances of persons affected by the provisions of this section;".

(3) Proviso to sub-clause (7) shall be omitted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 109.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—In regard to Clause 109, it says:

"The Central Government may at any time before or after the appointed day give such directions to any State as may appear to it to be necessary for the purpose of giving effect to the foregoing provisions of this Part."

This is another blank cheque power that they are seeking to take and I propose, for the reasons I have already stated, that this clause may be deleted from the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"Clause 109 shall be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 110.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—This clause relates to provisions as to State Public Service Commissions. I beg to move;

'In sub-clause (3), the word "constituted" shall be omitted.'

Because it has been constituted here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'In sub-clause (3), the word "constituted" shall be omitted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 112.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I beg to move:

'For the words "one year", the words "two years" shall be substituted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

'For the word "one year", the words "two years" shall be substituted'.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I oppose this amendment. The other day the member for Bellary was complaining how the different sets of rules and laws prevailing in the areas of Bellary District were affecting the interests of that area. When a new State is formed we may give some breathing time but not the time that has been asked for by the mover of this amendment. It should be possible for any Government personnel within a year, within 12 months, to adopt all laws that are prevailing in the State of Mysore at present to the entire area that will come under the jurisdiction of this State. I therefore see no reason why any more time should be taken than what has been provided under this clause.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—We will try to do these things within a year, as the Hon'ble Member thinks. But we have asked for a maximum limit, maximum period. Everybody knows that there will be a lot of work for the Legislature, especially in the matter of Budget and Bills. We have to prepare another Budget in October and various pieces of legislation. Therefore, fixing two years is the utmost limit and I am prepared to sit with the House as long as possible and finish it within these months.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—The Central Government also is involved.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'For the words "one year", the words "two years" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 120.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Sir, I beg to move:

'In sub-clause (1), the word "previous" shall be inserted between the words "by" and "notification"'.

As amended, it will read as follows:

"The Central Government may, by previous notification in the Official Gazette, make rules to give effect to the provisions of this Act."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'In sub-clause (1), the word "previous" shall be inserted between the words "by" and "notification"'.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sri Anantaraman's amendment is not happily worded. It may be like this—

"The Central Government may, by previous publication of the notification in the Official Gazette..."

Because by previous notification he probably means previous publication.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has the Hon'ble Member permission to withdraw his amendment?

SEVERAL MEMBERS—.Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 122.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I think it has already been disposed of.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—No. I simply referred to it. May I move my amendment, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

'After clause 121, the following shall be added as part XI, namely—

"PART XI.

122. The President shall, by a proclamation and after the Legislatures of two or more contiguous new States have passed resolutions in this behalf, constitute for such States an authority to be designated a Pradesh Council, with such functions, executive and administrative, as may be delegated to it by the Union in respect of such subjects as may be in the Union List of the Seventh Schedule and any other power or function as may be prescribed in such proclamation and such other powers or functions relating to items in the State List of the Seventh Schedule as the Legislative Assemblies of the States concerned may by resolutions in this behalf specify, and by the same or subsequent proclamation define and declare, duties and organisation, composition and qualification of Members of such Council and generally prescribe every other incidental or ancillary matter as may be found necessary and expedient to carry out the intents and purposes of such proclamations".'

Sir, in a way, as has been rightly stated by my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar, I have prepared the ground these two days for this amendment to be considersd by this House. In fact I may not have much to add to what I have already said but still it is necessary to consider this amendment with sufficient emphasis. I want to place one or two aspects which are implicit in this amendment. I would like the House to consider them and give me a patient hearing for a minute or two.

In this amendment what I proposed to do has been referred to by many of us and these four years we have tried to interrogate ourselves whether we were moving towards a particular ideal that we had in view. Here I have

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

proposed that in reality if there is need for all the States to come together and if possible separatist tendencies and factional interests must be subordinated to the creation of larger interest and larger national sentiment and feeling, a step will have to be taken in this direction. And it has always been my idea whether a constitutional garb should be given to this objective. In order to emphasise that I have brought forward this amendment. Against this background you have to consider this amendment. Only a day or two ago we discussed the question of Zonal Council. Even when the debate on that was taking place, it must be granted that the Leader of the House was in unison with me when I wanted to canvass the support of the House. Many members have taken part in the debate on this question and have also well considered the amendment to clause 21 relating to the Zonal Council and to invest that Council with powers, not merely to be set up as stated in the Bill placed before us but give it a real life and activity and make it a limb of the constitutional body of this country so that it may serve a definite purpose, a definite constitutional purpose, and not merely be an advisory body. With all these ideas before us we were discussing the clause relating to the Zonal Council. Here I am trying to give a concrete shape to the several ideas which have been placed. If really there is a tendency that South Indian States particularly should come together under a wider set-up, I have tried to implement these two principal ideas. One important consideration in my humble opinion which I want to impress upon this House is, the State's individuality as such, the purpose for which it is designed and brought into existence, may be kept intact. It is not the case of the Stat elosing its individuality in a bigger whole. To certain purposes, natural and legitimate, the States shall continue, and this is one of the ideas which we wanted to subserve in this particular clause.

So far as the States are concerned, List No. 2 which refers to States' subjects must be left in tact and wherever there is need to take some of these subjects to a wider field, it must be by an affirmative resolution passed in this behalf by the States concerned. Therefore, one important consideration that I want to emphasise is the State's integrity, State's individuality, the purpose for which it is designed, will be left intact except to the extent where the States by their own affirmative resolution feel like saying that some of those subjects which are of common interest and which are suitable to be handed over should be done so.

This is so far as the States' list is concerned. Then there is another List, the Union List under the Seventh Schedule. A number of subjects have been put in there. As a matter of fact even the residuary power has been put in there. Therefore, if really a new body is to come into existence with certain definite constitutional functions to perform, and not be a merely advisory body, in order that that body should come into life and purpose. I have suggested that some of the subjects which were in the Union List may be delegated to this body. As a matter of fact, even according to the Constitution particularly in articles 258 and 263 to which reference has already been made, power of the Union to confer powers on States in certain cases has been provided. Article 258 says—

> "Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may, with the consent of the Government of a State, entrust either conditionally or unconditionally to the Government or to its officers functions in relation to any matter to which the executive power of the Union extends."

Similarly in 263, there are provisions with respect to inter-State Council and consultation. What I have tried is, I have put the two together and added one more rider. In fact the Leader of the House while speaking about Zonal Council drew attention of the House to this and I considered that there is great force in what he said. If really these things have to be

effected, it means amendment of the Constitution. But there is nothing wrong in that. As a matter of fact even in the explanatory note given they have suggested that if necessary, and when there is need, if an occasion arose and if amendments have necessarily to take place, they are going to bring separate legislation to that effect. Therefore this is the proper time for us to consider the question, to provide on the one side that the State Legislature's legislative sovereignty,—I will use the word individuality,—was secured and on the other, the new body that comes into existence shall derive its authority and discharge its functions in a manner without any inroad into the State's domain. Therefore as in the Union List there are a number of subjects which can conveniently be transacted by a new body, I have suggested in the second part that, but subject to the over-all control of the Central Government. If you go through the Union List you will discover them. You will kindly see that some of them have already been embodied in the amendment proposed by the Leader of the House. There are subjects like Nos. 22, 23, 31, 66 and 81. As regards broad policy questions of prohibition, of inter-State Commerce, University, standards of education, etc., all these are questions which can conveniently be transacted by several States in conjunction. In fact, what advantage can be derived when certain works are to be transancted here but subject to the over-all Central control? It is 1,600 miles away. The main point is, it is the well-being of the people here that is sought to be improved. Therefore, more conveniently, more economically and with greater despatch work can be transacted from near about the person who is going to be benefited and there is a machinery to do that. Considering all these I have suggested the amendment. The time has come when certain subjects can conveniently and necessarily be delegated. As a matter of fact, I go a step further. If, as a result of this, 122 is accepted, we will be making room for what can develop to, as I have said on very many occasions in this House, a sub-federation to come into existence. What is the idea of this sub-federation? The most important and the cardinal point in a sub-federation is that so far as the federating units are concerned, their individualities are safeguarded. They have a certain definite function of their own even as there are certain functions of the Centre. Therefore, while we see the States are ensured their separateness and individuality, they work in conjunction with the Centre in certain fields of common interest. I may recall to your mind, Sir, the question of financial integration and the creation of one federal structure for the whole country. The Finance Commission is appointed by the Government of India to go into the problems of the whole sub-continent as an integrated matter. On the one hand it looks as though we have the unitary and on the other the federal structure. On the one hand we hear the cry for decentralisation against the centralisation that is now going on. Sir, it is a very important and a cardinal point that should be remembered by all interested in rebuilding the States of India on a more rational and administratively best basis. Time is gone when we could rest content with a haphazard state of affairs. In fact Congress had made its own pledges that this kind of decentralisation and appropriate reorganisation would be taken up after Independence. But here is a helpful provision placed before this House and it is for this House to consider. We have come to realise the futility of these Zonal Councils. This House has only yesterday accepted the resolution for the formation of Dakshina Pradesh. Here is the acid test facing the House. While we visualise Dakshina Pradesh on the distant horizon, well here is a resolution and let us make a humble beginning by accepting this amendment. But if we are not prepared to have this sub-federal unit in embryo with administrative, legislative and financial powers as envisaged in this new clause 122 but still say we are going to have something like a Dakshina Pradesh wherever and whenever possible, I can understand neither

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

the antithesis in or the synthesis of these ideas. Here is the test placed before us in this House. If we are sincere in our intentions, we must accept this new clause. If for any reason we reject this clause, it will be clearly understood that the House disregarded the dictates of common sense and reason in a matter so fundamental and so important. It only means that while the House accepted the ambitious formation of Dakshina Pradesh, it declined to make a beginning. However I request that this amendment be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

'After clause 121, the following shall be added as part XI namely :—

"PART XI.

122. The President shall, by a proclamation and after the Legislatures of two or more contiguous new States have passed resolutions in this behalf, constitute for such States an authority to be designated a Pradesh Council, with such functions, executive and administrative, as may be delegated to it by the Union in respect of such subjects as may be in the Union List of the Seventh Schedule and any other power or function as may be prescribed in such proclamation and such other powers or functions relating to items in the State List of the Seventh Schedule as the Legislative Assemblies of the States concerned may by resolution in this behalf specify, and by the same or subseqnent proclamation define and declare, duties and organisation, composition and qualification of members of such Council and generally prescribe every other incidental or ancillary matter as may be found necessary and expedient to carry out the intents and purposes of such proclamations."'

*Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I tried my best to persuade myself to accept at least the underlying principle running through the amendment sponsored by my Hon'ble friend Sri Pattabhi Raman. But however much I tried, Sir, I could not see the logic of it.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—None so deaf as those who have ears but will not hear and none so blind as those who have eyes but will not see.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The House has accepted to retain clauses 16 to 21 which envisage the formation of Zonal Councils for all-India. When they have accepted that principle, Sir, is it open to him now to wax eloquent with regard to the merits or demerits of the particular clauses which he has sponsored ? Sir, he wanted to play on sentiments relating to this idea of Dakshina Pradesh. I am sure that Hon'ble Members will not fall into his trap, for very good reasons, not because there is no merit in this case, but because it is a false trap. It is not even a genuine trap. Let my Hon'ble friend clearly realise whether it is open to him to amend the Constitution in the way in which he proposes. Sir, he quoted Articles 258 and 263. Sir, with very great respect, I beg to state that Articles 258 and 263 have been designedly put in the Constitution to serve certain purposes. The very heading of that Chapter is to adjust administrative relations between units and the States and the States *inter se*. Therefore certain powers were vested with the President to be used whenever certain disputes arise or whenever certain things happen which need immediate corrective. That is why they thought it wise to invest the President with these powers. They were not intended permanently to set up a new pattern for the whole of India. Therefore, I very humbly suggest that the scope of Articles 258 and 263 was limited. But what is envisaged under this is . . . .

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Why not we read Article 258, Sir ? This is what it says :

"258 (1) Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may, with the consent of

> the Government of a State, entrust either conditionally or unconditionally to that Government or to its officers functions in relation to any matter to which the executive power of the Union extends."

What is suggested is that it is open to the President to entrust the Government of a State or its officers with the powers of the Union in respect of any matter. I do not understand how there is anything inconsistent with it..

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I emphatically say, it cannot be so. This is only a contingency for which provision is made. He wants the constitution of the Zonal Councils to be brought under this. Therefore, Sir, what he has stated cannot hold water, not because there is no merit in the Zonal Councils, but because it is a differrnt context where very probably it would have been accepted by this House. Sir, what is intended is this: as the Hon'ble Leader of the House has stated, whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Zonal Council, it has been conceived in the best interests of India. They want to work it in a mere advisory capacity for the time being so that when the States get grouped together, they would work for a common purpose without giving room for any friction between themselves. They do not envisage a permanent body like this because it requires an amendment of the Constitution.

I would put him another question, Sir. Does he really think that we have accepted the setting up of Zonal Councils by accepting the idea as envisaged in the Bill? Does it not require a fundamental change in the structure of the Constitution? This idea had to be put in because the Government of India thought that unless there was a co-ordinating agency there would be internal dissension between States even in the same region and in order to effect such co-ordination, they have thought of this arrangement in the scheme of reorganisation of the States. He goes one step further and says that he wants a sub-federation. What should be the structure of that sub-federation? Who are all the parties to bring into being such a sub-federation? And is there a committee which has gone into the whole question of sub-federation to ascertain to what extent the States are prepared to surrender their powers to such a sub-federation, and whether the Centre is prepared to surrender some of its powers to such a sub-federation? These are very vital matters not to be taken up now but have to be considered at the higher level. It is only when a competent authority has gone into this matter and the whole constitutional structure that the question of sub-federation can be tackled. In all humility I would suggest to him that what he has suggested by means of this amendment is not one which can be accepted by this House. After all, he has tried to place before the House a good idea in which all Southern States could be formed. But it cannot be done in the form in which he has envisaged. There are better steps to be taken before it can be considered. Sir, it requires consultation among the States and it envisages a certain amount of sacrifice on the part of the States and the Centre and both parties must be prepared to surrender a portion of their respective powers and responsibilities. To what extent the Centre is prepared to surrender its rights is the sugtion. These are very vital matters. It is only 6 years since we have been trying this type of Constitution and it is too early to change the structure and establish a sub-federation. People must get accustomed, and the States also must be prepared, to surrender their rights to a certain extent. Therefore I beg of my friend to be patient for a little while and try to sponsor this idea at the proper forum. Sir, may I even suggest that Parliament would be the proper forum for the consideration of such subject and not the State Legislature?

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I do not propose to take much time lest I may spoil the effect produced on the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No effect is produced.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It has produced its effect though it is not manifest and open. Sri T. Mariappa stated that

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

the present Constitution of India is of a federal nature. I seriously dispute this. I submit that the Constitution is not of a federal nature because, in a federation, the States will have their own powers; they will have their own individuality. But now, Sir, I think, the main object is. . .

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—My friend states a proposition that in the case of a federation, the residuary powers are left to the States. It is not so. In some kinds of federation, the residuary power will vest in the States and in certain others, it will vest in the Centre.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is my humble opinion that the present Constitution of India is far from being federal. On the other hand, it is neither federal nor unitary type of Constitution. It is some anomalous type of Constitution. (Laughter.) Sir, the Chief Minister was telling us something and he was complaining that the Centre has been trying to grab as much power as possible.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There is no question of grabbing. The Constitution itself invests the Centre with certain powers.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Our point is that that Constitution should be changed.

It is a fact that there has been too much of over-centralisation, the States being deprived of their powers. Practically at present, the States are nothing more than the District Boards What I suggest and what my friend is suggesting through this amendment is that over-centralisation must be stopped; States should have their powers and their individuality must be maintained. It is mainly on this ground that he has tabled this amendment. I also agree with him when he says that a kind of sub-federation must be formed in this country and the Centre must be advised to transfer its powers or delegate its powers to this sub-federation.

5 P.M.

Sir, the idea of constituting the Zonal Council or formation of Dakshina Pradesh is nothing but an eye-wash and this is a proposal which could not be implemented at all. Even if implemented, it would create more complications. So, I say that the States should stand on their own legs and realise their responsibility both financially and administratively and the States in the particular Zonal Council must come to an understanding and form a sub-federal unit. Sri T. Mariappa was saying about the powers to be transferred.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It must be examined carefully; it is not in the way in which the Hon'ble Member is suggesting it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes, that must be examined in its entirety and if need be, the Constitution must be amended. Sir, all this might have been done with good intention. The original idea was, Defence, Communication and Foreign Affairs should be under the Central Government. But, now almost all important powers have been taken away and the States have become nothing but the satellites of the Centre, depending on the Centre for everything. Sir, if States are given more power, it does not mean that the unity of India would be jeopardised, or there will be disunity. When occasion arises every State will place all its resources at the disposal of the Centre. Sir, India is a vast country and the Centre is doing the best for the development of India. With all their good intentions, they cannot bestow equal attention on all the regions of India. So, on that account I say that a time has come when the whole structure of the Constitution has to be examined and each Pradesh given some federal powers and each State must be given ample scope to retain its individuality. On this ground I commend the amendment for the acceptance of this House.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I agree when the Leader of the Opposition stated that very good effect has been produced by the Hon'ble Member Sri K. Pattabhiraman. He also said that he did not want to spoil that effect; but the Leader of the Opposition has completely succeeded in spoiling that effect. (*Laughter*).

Sir, very fundamental issues have been raised. *Bona fides* have been attacked. It would have been better if my Hon'ble friend Sri Pattabhiraman had not talked about *bona fides* in this connection. I grant to every one in this House complete *bona fides* when they discuss issues relating to the constitutional structure. You will therefore, pardon me, Sir, if I take a few minutes for explaining the position. So far as we, in the Treasury Benches, are concerned, both Sri Pattabhiraman and the Leader of the House, have stressed the advisability of forming a sub-federation. I may state definitely and categorically that I am not in agreement with that ideal. Sir, if Hon'ble Members of this House just recall the discussions on constitutional matters since the days of the First Round Table Conference, the picture would be clear to them.

There were 500 odd States in India. The question arose as to how to integrate them into one administrative unit under one constitution. The 500 odd States were different. The Princes would not agree to any kind of union with the rest of the provinces then existed. Therefore, the idea of a confederation emerged as a compromise between what is called, complete administrative independence of the Indian State and the British Indian Provinces. When this idea of confederation was being discussed, the Round Table Conference met.

And for the first time Gandhiji sponsored the idea of federation. That idea for a long time was not acceptable to the representatives of the Princes in the Round Table Conference. Therefore, it did not materialise. Even when the 1935 Act which ushered in provincial autonomy, came into existence, the idea of federation did not materialise and elections were held and you know the Government of India granted what is called provincial autonomy, keeping Indian States separately and the British Indian Provinces separately. The idea of federation did not materialise. In the meanwhile, a Professor belonging to the Conservative Party, which was not too friendly to India, sponsored the idea of sub-federation. You all remember the name of Professor Coupland. He wrote a very big book. At that time I happened to be in jail. I had no other bussiness to do. I read the big volume of Prof. Coupland from cover to cover and I may state for the information of the House that my first instinct when I read that book sponsoring the idea of sub-federation was to see that India did not emerge as one nation, India did not forge unity which might ultimately make that country independent of British imperialism. The idea therefore was summarily rejected; it was attacked on all hands. Every Paper in India dismissed the idea of sub-federation as one which affected Indian unity and solidarity. I happened to be in the Constituent Assembly when this Constitution was drafted and I had the privilege to represent Mysore State at that time. I had my own share; it may be a very very minor share in the matter of finally drafting various articles of the Constitution. In the Constituent Assembly also we considered that this idea of sub-federation was not in the interests of the State. We gave it up. Then the question arose whether the Constitution that we have to draft should be a federal one. The conditions in India then were such that we needed a Constitution which guaranteed unity and solidarity of India for all time. We did not want to take chances. Therefore a compromise was effected in the ideology between federation and unitary system of Government. People were not wanting in the Consitituent Assembly who said that in order to guarantee Indian unity and solidarity we must have a unitary system of Government. The past history of India showed that we had always a tendency to differ from one another and split up into small independent States. We remember in this State in particular there were what are called Pallegars. We did not want to go back to the days of Pallegars. Therefore, the idea emerged which ultimately was accepted by the Constituent Assembly of the Union. You will therefore see the progress of thought from stage to stage. It began with the idea of confederation. Then

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)
sub-federation idea was mooted by nterested quarters who were none too friendly to India and therefore was rejected outright. The idea of federation emerged and in the subsequent process it was thought best in the nterests of the country and the solidarity and unity to have a Constitution called the Union Constitution. In the process of working that Union Constitution for the last 5½ years, the Centre, it is true, is taking more and more power into its hands by virtue of the large financial resources it has in its hands. The process of working the Constitution has somewhat distorted the Union Constitution into almost unitary Constitution. That is the position.

What I have been feeling all the time is that this tendency of a unitary system em must be arrested and whatever has been incorporateed in the Constitution must be correctly himplemented. That is the stand I have taken. Over-centralsetion is leading in effect and substance to unitary form of Government. I want to arrest that tendency in the interest of good and efficient administration. I hope my friends will correctly understand my stand.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—You said sub-federation ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—No. So, Sir, if the resolution that we adopted yesterday is construed as one whic sponsors the idea of sub-federation, as the mover of the resolution and as the author of the resolution I will make it clear that that was not my intention and it is not the intention of the resolution. What probably is,—time will show,—a tendency on the part of different States in South India, East India or West India to become one bigger State. But it is not sub-federation. They will become one State. It may be the size is bigger. That is all the difference. If we try to incorporate the idea of sub-federation through these Zonal Councils, that is nobody's case. That will not happen. If sub-federations are formed in India there will be three types of Governments and Legislatures and Administration, one at the State level, one at the sub-federation level and one at the Central level. That structure is going to be cumbersome and costly. Anybody who bestows thought over it for a while will understand that this sub-federation will not be in the interest of speedy and efficient administration. So I request my friends not to stress on this idea of sub-federation. The Zonal Councils are intended for the purpose of mutual consultation between State and State and between groups of States and the Centre. It is now at the stage of consultation. If the Zonal Councils pave the way for the formation of bigger States. then the logical proposition is we may accept it ultimately or not and that is a different question. But these Zonal Councils are not intended to usher in sub-federation. That is the idea. I have already answered various doubts that have been raised on this issue by my friends Sri K. Pattabhiraman and Sri M.V. Rama Rao. I have already said that their views will be conveyed to the Government of India. I would even request the Hon'ble Members for Kolar and Tumkur to give me a note containing their ideas about these things in a precise manner and I will undertake to forward them to the proper quarters for earnest consideration.

Sir, I have taken it as the concensus of opinion of this House that State Governments must be allowed latitude in administrative and legislative fields that is guaranteed to them under the Constitution. That would be quite a sufficient concession the Central Government would be giving. The former Auditor and Accountant General told me in one of our discussions that funds which are meant for Central purposes are being utilised for State purposes and funds which are completely at the disposal of State Assemblies and Government are being compulsorily made to be used for Central purposes. This is a distortion of our financial picture.

This has to be rectified. Sir, this idea of Zonal Councils has emerged anew. The intention is of course to bring into existence harmonious relationship between State and State and between groups of States and the

'entre. Let us work it for a time. 'ractical working will show the orrect and proper way for us to follow. .ny amount of theoretical discussions 'ill not do. As I said, in the Constiuent Assembly when we bargained for he Union Constitution, we never nagined in those days that the Central lovernment would be able to encroach pon the State Lists. What happened 7as, because we placed greater moneary resources at the disposal of the 'entre, the Central Government turns ound to us and says : 'If you implenent this idea within the State, we vill give so much grant'; we cannot .fford to lose that grant. In order to ;et these grants, somehow or other, or .nyhow, we are giving up most of our owers and responsibilities. In the old lays, we all know that rural communiation, or a bridge or a school was the province of the district board. That as been now taken up by the Central Government under the local developnent works. These are things that re happening. If we succeed in asserting our rights and responsibilities that re guaranteed to us under the Constitution, that will certainly solve all our troubles. We have to remember that with the advance of science and technology, society changes; when society changes, Governmental structures also change. Communications and technological advance have made India not only a small country but have shrunk the whole world into one unit as it were. A person can go to England within 24 hours. It used to take two or three months in the old days. So it is communications and technological knowledge that largely determine the pattern of society and patterns of Government. We have accepted unanimously that we must plan and that we must plan on an all-India level. We cannot go back upon that idea. When we plan we plan for the whole of India. We cannot plan for each State separately. When we plan for the whole of India and allocate our resources on that basis, it is impossible for us to go back and plan for ourselves. What should be done now is: when planning is done at the all-India level, execution of these plans must be entrusted effectively and completely to the State Governments. Take for example the Honnemaradu Project. That project is included under the Five-Year Plan. It was not merely the Mysore Government that planned it, but the Planning Commission accepted the idea. Ultimately, it was accepted as an item under the All-India Plan. It finds a place also in our plan. But it is part of the Second Five-Year Plan that is applicable to the whole of India. But its execution is entrusted to the Mysore Government. Likewise in every field of administration, planning may be done at an All-India level. But the execution of these projects must be entrusted completely and effectively to the States concerned.

That will ensure economic and speedy implementation and avoidance of waste of time and energy. That is the view I hold and that is the view I have been repeatedly placing before this House. My friend Sri Pattabhiraman will now see that he should give a chance for these Zonal Councils to fare. There is time for us to suggest amendments and improvements and if necessary, even abolish them. In view of the clarification I have given I am sure my friend will withdraw his amendment.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—With my right to press this view guaranteed, I propose to request the House to permit me to withdraw the amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule III.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move :

> 'That in the table, in the third column, against serial number 9, for the figures "182", the figures "208" shall be substituted.'

Sir, five different administrative units are being merged in order to bring into existence a new State of Mysore. In these five administrative units, the constituencies vary. For a constituency of Lok Sabha, there is Madras, Bombay and Hyderabad. The figure varies from 5 to 7. In Mysore we have the multiple as 9. In the Bill

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

I find that the only State that has been given the multiple of 9 is Assam. That is a special case because the area is very vast but the population is small. Taking these two together, they have made it an exception and given the figure of 9 as the multiple. So far as other States are concerned, it varies from 5 to 7.

Here, in Mysore State, as it is going to be constituted, it would be unreasonable for us to ask for the multiple of 9. I therefore propose a compromise between the figure 7 that has now been conceded and the figure 9 that we are now enjoying in Mysore State, to a figure of 8. This must be accepted because whenever we make a suggestion, it must be acceptable to the Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

> 'That in the table, in the third column, against serial number 9, for the figures "182", the figures "208" shall be substituted.'

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂಬತ್ತು ಇರಬೇಕು, 33ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಡಿಲೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಈಗ 33ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜು ಪಾಸಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ವಿಚಾರ ಈಗ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ನೆರೆಹೊರೆಯ ಆರು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮದರಾಸನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 5ರಷ್ಟು ಇರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ 7ರಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇದೆ; ಕೇರಳ ಮತ್ತು ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಆರರಂತಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ತೆಗೆದುಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅದೂ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದುದರಿಂದ ಬೇರೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಸ್ಸಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 9ರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏರಿಯಾ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಧ್ಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ 72 ಸಾವಿರ ಚದರ ಮೈಲಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಉಳ್ಳದ್ದು. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡ 8ರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಉತ್ತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ 5ರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ 60ಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ 69 ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಬೆಳಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ಅವರ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯ ಪರರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲು ಈ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಹೂಡಿದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳದೆ ವಿಧಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ದುಡ್ಡು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ; ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಯುಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದಿವಸ ಈ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೊಡಗಿನಿಂದ 20-24 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಅದೂ ಕೇವಲ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ ದುಡ್ಡು ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ವಾದಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರೇ ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯೂ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಆತ್ಮವಾದರೂ ಹೇಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿತೋ ನಾನಂತೂ ಕಾಣೆ! ಒಂದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪದಿದ್ದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಏಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಶುದ್ಧ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I support the amendment because while speaking on this Bill I proposed that at least the ratio should be 1 : 9. For Assam they have given 1 : 9 for Madhya Pradesh 1 : 8 and Rajastan 1 : 8. Regarding Kerala, as Sri Hutche-Gowda said, it is a very small territory with 14,000 square miles. If you compare the area with other areas, what they have given is quite reasonable. The larger the representation in the Lower House the better for the country. Even in the House of Commons more than 600 members are allowed to sit there. What has been proposed in this amendment is very modest. I would earnestly appeal to the members of the House to accept this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> 'That in the table, in the third colummn, against serial number 9, for the figures "182", the figures "208" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Fourth Schedule.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—In regard to the Fourth Schedule, I would request Sri Srinivasa Iyengar to allow me to move my amendment because our ideas are more or less the same and there is no necessity for him to move his amendment.

Sir, I move :

"In the Fourth Schedule,—

1. In the modified form of section 3 of the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Act, 1953 :

(1) in the Table annexed to sub-section (1), for the existing entries relating to Mysore State in columns 1 and 2 respectively, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 2.62 excluding (Bellary district)

.22 (Bellary district)";

(2) in the Table annexed to sub-section (2), for the existing entries relating to Mysore State in columns 1,2 and 3 respectively, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 3.03 2.62 (excluding Bellary district)";

II. In the modified form of paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Constitution (Distribution of Revenues) Order, 1953,—

(1) in clause (2) of paragraph 3, for the existing entries relating to Mysore State, the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 2.25 (excluding Bellary district);

.20 (Bellary district) ;

(2) in clause (3) of paragraph 3, for the existing entries relating to Mysore State, the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 3.97 2.25 (excluding Bellary district)."

5-30 P.M.

Sir, the percentages indicated in the Fourth Schedule under I (3) (1) and II (3) (2) include the percentage due to Bellary district. If the position as stated in the Schedule accepted, it would mean that th revenue gap of 3.45 crores assured for the Mysore State excluding Bellary District would be applicable to Mysore State inclusive of Bellary district. We would therefore be deprived of the benefit of additional percentage of .22 for excise duties and .20 for taxes on income, which we are now getting under the provisions of the Andhra State Act exclusive of the revenue gap referred to above. The amendment suggested will remove this anomaly and assure the revenue gap of 3.45 crores to the State of Mysore as it existed prior to 1st October 1953, the date on which Bellary district was added to Mysore.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'In the Fourth Schedule,—

1. in the modified form of section 3 of the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Act, 1953 :

(1) in the table annexed to sub-section (1), for the existing entries relating to Mysore State in columns 1 and 2 respectively, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 2.62 (excluding Bellary district) ;

.22 (Bellary Distrct)";

(2) in the table annexed to sub-section (2), for the existing entries relating to Mysore State in columns 1,2 and 3 respectively, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 3.03 2.62 (excluding Bellary district)";

11. In the modified form of paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Constitution (Distribution of Revenues) Order, 1953,—

(1) in clause (2) of paragraph (3), for the existing entries relating to Mysore State,

(MR. SPEAKER.)

the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

"Mysore : 2.25 (excluding Bellary District);

·20 (Bellary district)";

(2) in clause (3) of paragraph 3, for the existing entries relating to Mysore State, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

"Mysore : 3.97 2.25 (excluding Bellary district)" '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sixth Schedule.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, certain additons have been made to the institutions mentioned therein as facilities with regard to these additional institutions would be required when the new State is formed. Hence I beg to move.—

"In the Sixth Schedule, after item (10) the following items shall be added at the end, namely :—

(11) Finger Print Bureau

(12) Chemical Examiner's Institution."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"In the Sixth Schedule, after item (10) the following items shall be added at the end, namely :—

(11) Finger Print Bureau

(12) Chemical Examiner's Institution."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has an amendment.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—do not propose to move it.

Motion to approve.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Now, move :

"That this House having considered the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, approves of the same subject to the amendments and modifications made thereto by this House."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That this House having considered the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, approves of the same subject to the amendments and modifications made thereto by this House."

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—Service integration ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ move ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ವಿಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕರಣಮಾಡಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕರಣವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವವನು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇಂಟೆಗ್ರೇಷನ್ ಆದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಂತರವಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸಮನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒದಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಆತಂಕದಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ allowances ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಯಿತು. I.A.S. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅವನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗದು ಎಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಗಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಆವಾಗ ತೊಂದರೆಪಡುವವರು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಜನ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ನೌಕರರು. ಈಗ ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ದೇಶ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲ, ಇಡೀ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕಿಂತ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾದ ದೇಶ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯೂ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು: ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರು ತೊಂದರೆಪಡಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಆತಂಕದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರೇನಾದರೂ insist ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಆವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ, ಅವರ status ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹೊರಗಿನವರಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಬಾರದು. ಒಂದೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇರಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇರಲಿ ಒಂದೇ status ಇರಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸಂಬಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ 20 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ 40 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ seniority ಮತ್ತು promotion ಇವುಗಳ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇವರು ಕೆಳ ದರ್ಜೆಗೆ

ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇವರುಗಳ service ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲಸ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸೀನಿಯಾರಿಟಿ ಮುಂತಾದುವನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, in regard to the point raised by my Hon'ble friend Sri Hutche Gowda, I have already enunciated the policy of this Government in my Budget speech.

Sir, now we have come to the conclusion of our labours. I must note with great satisfaction, Sir, the feelings of great cordiality that existed when this Bill was discussed. We note the contrast when we remember the great difference of opinion that prevailed when the Resolution on the Report of the S. R. C. was sponsored before this House. Time has healed our differences as I once hoped. To-day, the atmosphere that is prevailing in this House has guaranteed that the coming into existence of the new State will be in an atmosphere of goodwill and understanding. It is true that a prominent leader of Uttar Karnataka has issued a statement and sent wires without knowing the position here, without understanding our feelings here. I hope that with the goodwill of this House we will be able to make other people also see the point of view that we have adopted. It is because we have not been able to meet and discuss matters that they are taking up a stand which is not appreciated in this House and in this State. A day will come when we will be able to sit together and discuss matters and produce a harmonious feeling between the members of this House and the incoming people as we have succeeded in bringing about the goodwill and understanding between one section of the opinion and the other, in the creation of the new State. I pray God may bless us with good sense and understanding in order to bring into existence this new State in an atmosphere of cordiality and goodwill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That this House having considered the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, approves of the same subject to the amendments and modifications made thereto by this House."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Forty-two Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet at Twelve of the Clock on Friday, 6th April 1956.

WD 2896—GPB—550—9-8-56

V-, 32 " N 56
N 56·14-3-21-9
B' 5000